



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/772,843	02/04/2004	Conor Cahill	AOL0095	6050
22862 7590 06/23/2009 GLENN PATENT GROUP 3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L MENLO PARK, CA 94025				
EXAMINER				
LE, CANH				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2439				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/23/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/772,843

Applicant(s)

CAHILL ET AL.

Examiner

CANH LE

Art Unit

2439

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 March 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-11 and 13-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-11 and 13-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 11, 15, and 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 March 2009 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the communication filed on 03/18/2009.

Claims 1-8 and 12 have been cancelled.

Claims 9-11 and 17-23 have been amended.

Claims 24-26 have been added.

Claims 9-11 and 13-26 have been examined and are pending.

Response to Arguments

The amendment filed 03/18/2009 of the drawings (figures 1-2) is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: removed the **“prior art”** in figures 1-2.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

The amended drawing filed on 03/18/2009 of figures 1-2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(e)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be

notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Applicant's arguments, see page 8, filed 03/18/2009, with respect to the 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd rejection of claim 21 have been fully considered. The 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd rejection of claim 21 has been withdrawn due to amendment.

Applicant's arguments filed 03/18/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues the following:

(A) Yared does not teach the new amended limitations:

(a) establishing one or more affiliations of computer-implemented service providers, each affiliation collectively programmed to act as a single entity on a network for purposes of any of authentication, federation, and authorization;

(b) establishing a computer-implemented owner of each said affiliation that is programmed to maintain a list that shows which service providers are members of said affiliation, as well as any control structure or meta-data associated with said affiliation; and

(c) providing a unique identifier for each said affiliation within said single sign-on system in which said affiliation is defined.

(B) There is nothing in Yared to teach or suggest an affiliation, and more particularly, an affiliation of service providers that acts as a single entity on the network as claimed.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant for the following reasons:

Per (A):

Yared teaches the new amended limitations:

(a) establishing one or more affiliations of computer-implemented service providers, each affiliation collectively programmed to act as a single entity on a network for purposes of any of authentication, federation, and authorization [Yared: fig. 9; par. [0117]; “Identity Provider A 905 is linked with Service Provider A 910 and service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked”];

(b) establishing a computer-implemented owner of each said affiliation that is programmed to maintain a list that shows which service providers are members of said affiliation, as well as any control structure or meta-data associated with said affiliation [Yared: fig. 9; par. [0117]; “Identity Provider A 905 is linked with Service Provider A 910 and service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked”; user directory 920 includes Service Provider A & Service Provider B]; and

(c) providing a unique identifier for each said affiliation within said single sign-on system in which said affiliation is defined [Yared: fig. 9; par. [0117]; “Identity Provider A 905 is linked with service Provider A 910 and Service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked”; “This configuration allows a user to authentication with multiple service providers 910, 915 using identity provider A 905;” par. [0009]; A single sign-on architecture is provided to facilitate user

interactions with service providers; Identity Provider A is a unique identifier for affiliation of Service Provider A and Service Provider B; par. [0045]; lines 6-8].

Per (B):

Yared teaches an affiliation of service providers that acts as a single entity on the network [Yared: fig. 9; par. [0117]; “Identity Provider A 905 is linked with service Provider A 910 and Service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked”; “This configuration allows a user to authentication with multiple service providers 910, 915 using identity provider A 905;” par. [0009]; A single sign-on architecture is provided to facilitate user interactions with service providers; Identity Provider A is a unique identifier for affiliation of Service Provider A and Service Provider B; par. [0045]; lines 6-8].

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Since fig.1 and fig. 2 are labeled “Prior Art,” All descriptions (page 7, line 5 to page 9, line 23 of the specification) related to the above figures should be placed under “BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION” section. Appropriate correction is required.

Drawings

The amendment filed 03/18/2009 of the drawings (figures 1-2) is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that

no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: removed the “**prior art**” in figures 1-2.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

The amended drawing filed on 03/18/2009 of figures 1-2 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art-- because only that which is old is illustrated. See MPEP § 608.02(g). Corrected drawings in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled “Replacement Sheet” in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

Claims 11, 15, and 25 are objected to because of the following informalities:

(Claim 11, line 5): “other service providers” should be replaced “other service provider” to avoid potentially antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

(Claim 15, line 2): “said other service provider affiliation” should be replaced “other service provider affiliation” to avoid potentially antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

(Claim 25, line 3): “protocol” should be replaced “lightweight protocol” to avoid potentially antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 9-11, 13-25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The amended claim 9 recites the new added limitation “each affiliation collectively programmed” in line 4 and “said affiliation that is programmed” in line 6-7 (Emphasis added). However, the aforementioned limitation was not described in the original specification. As a result, the specification fails to convey to one skilled in the art at the time the application was filed, that the inventor(s) had possession of the claimed invention.

The amended claim 10 recites the new added limitation “providing an identity programmed to authenticate” in line 3 (Emphasis added). However, the aforementioned limitation was not described in the original specification. As a result, the specification fails to

convey to one skilled in the art at the time the application was filed, that the inventor(s) had possession of the claimed invention.

The amended claim 18 recites the new added limitation “multiple affiliation, but are programmed to act only” (Emphasis added). However, the aforementioned limitation was not described in the original specification. As a result, the specification fails to convey to one skilled in the art at the time the application was filed, that the inventor(s) had possession of the claimed invention.

The new claim 26 recites the limitation “service providers collectively programmed” in line 3 and “said affiliation that is programmed” in lines 5-6 and “said owner is programmed” in line 9 (Emphasis added). However, the aforementioned limitation was not described in the original specification. As a result, the specification fails to convey to one skilled in the art at the time the application was filed, that the inventor(s) had possession of the claimed invention.

Claims 10-11, 13-25 are dependent on claim 9, and therefore inherit the 35 U.S.C 112, first paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement of the independent claims.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 9-11, 13-25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The amended claim 9 recites the new added limitation “each affiliation collectively programmed” in line 4 (Emphasis added). It is unclear the meaning of “collectively programmed”. It is indefinite what the phrase “collectively programmed” means.

The new claim 26 recites the limitation “service providers collectively programmed” in line 3 (Emphasis added). It is unclear the meaning of “collectively programmed”. It is indefinite what the phrase “collectively programmed” means.

Claim 26 recites the limitation “single sign-on system” in line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claims 10-11, 13-25 are dependent on claim 9, and therefore inherit the 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner kindly requests the Applicant to point out with specificity (i.e. column and line) in the specification where it describes/supports the aforementioned limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 26 recites a computer-implemented affiliation system, comprising: *“a computer-implemented affiliation of computer-implemented service providers”* (Emphasis added).

Although the preamble of the claim recites “an apparatus”, the body of the claim does not positively recite any element of hardware. There is no further description for *“a computer-implemented affiliation of computer-implemented service providers”* in the specification.

Therefore, the *“a computer-implemented affiliation of computer-implemented service providers”* are considered software modules; which are non-statutory subject matter. The merely recitation of the apparatus in the preamble with an absence of a machine in the body of the claim fails to make the claim statutory under 35 USC 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(c) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 9-11, 17-23, and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Yared et al.** (US 2003/0149781 A1).

As per claim 9:

Yared teaches a computer-implemented method for establishing an affiliation within a single sign-on system, comprising the steps of:

(a) establishing one or more affiliations of computer-implemented service providers, each affiliation collectively programmed to act as a single entity on a network for purposes of any of authentication, federation, and authorization [**Yared: fig. 9; par. [0117]; “Identity Provider A 905 is linked with Service Provider A 910 and service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked”**];

(b) establishing a computer-implemented owner of each said affiliation that is programmed to maintain a list that shows which service providers are members of said affiliation, as well as any control structure or meta-data associated with said affiliation [**Yared: fig. 9; par. [0117]; “Identity Provider A 905 is linked with Service Provider A 910 and service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked”**; user directory 920 includes Service Provider A & Service Provider B]; and

(c) providing a unique identifier for each said affiliation within said single sign-on system in which said affiliation is defined [**Yared: fig. 9; par. [0117]; “Identity Provider A 905 is linked with service Provider A 910 and Service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked”**; “This

configuration allows a user to authentication with multiple service providers 910, 915 using identity provider A 905;" par. [0009]; A single sign-on architecture is provided to facilitate user interactions with service providers; *Identity Provider A* is a unique identifier for affiliation of Service Provider A and Service Provider B; par. [0045]; lines 6-8].

As per claim 10:

Yared teaches the method of Claim 9, further comprising the steps of:

(a) each one of multiple principals acquiring a federated identity [Yared: par. [0047]; Embodiments of the present invention include single sign-on, *federated identity* and web service features; par. [0110-0111]; fig. 5 is an interaction flowchart illustrating *an identity federation process*; par. [0120-0121]; fig. 14, [0122]; "a user is authenticated by an identity provider and redirected to service provider"];

(b) providing an identity provider programmed to authenticate and vouch for said principals [Yared: par. [0009], lines 6-8; *An identity provider* is an entity that creates, manages, and stores identity information for a plurality of users; par. [0047]; a federated identity; par. [0110-0111]; fig. 5 is an interaction flowchart illustrating an identity federation process; par. [0120-0121]; fig. 14, [0122]; "a user is authenticated by an identity provider and redirected to service provider"]].

As per claim 11:

Yared teaches the method of Claim 10, further comprising the steps of:

(a) a principal logging into said identity provider [Yared: fig. 2; login to Identity Provider 225; par. [0062]; par. [0063]; “the user can then login to identity provider 225 using, for example a password-based identity credential”];

(b) said principal visiting a first service provider and federating to said affiliation [Yared: par. [0048-0049]; an identity provider authenticate a user’s identity and passes a credential to a service provider; par. [0047]; *by federating an account with an identity provider*, for example, a user can continue to login to a service provider using an existing service provider-specific username ; fig. 9; par. [0117]; “*Identity Provider A 905 is linked with Service Provider A 910 and service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked*”]; and

(c) said principal then visiting any other service provider within said affiliation without having to separately federate to said other service providers [Yared: par. [0047]; *by federating an account with an identity provider*, for example, a user can continue to login to a service provider using an existing service provider-specific username ... Further, the identity provider can be federated with other service providers that provide various application; ; fig. 9; par. [0117]; “*Identity Provider A 905 is linked with Service Provider A 910 and service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked*”].

As per claim 17:

Yared teaches the method of Claim 9, wherein said affiliation has an identifier that is unique within a single sign-on system in which said affiliation is defined [Yared: fig. 9; par. [0117];

“Identity Provider A 905 is linked with service Provider A 910 and Service provider B 915.

User directory 920 for *identity provider A 905* illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked”; par. [0009]; A *single sign-on architecture* is provided to facilitate user interactions with service providers].

As per claim 18:

Yared further teaches the method of Claim 9, wherein service providers within a single sign-on system may be members of multiple affiliations, but are programmed to act only with a single affiliation for any given transaction [Yared: par. [0047]; “ By federation an account with an identity provider, for example, a user can continue to login to a service provider using existing service provider-specific username and also have benefits if using the identity providers. Further, the identity provider can be federated with other services that provide various applications. As described in detail below, account federation enables system entities to collaborate to provide user a service or perform a service on behalf of the user”].

As per claim 19:

Yared further teaches the method of Claim 9, wherein a user federating with an affiliation automatically federates with all members of said affiliation [Yared: par. [0047]; “ By federation an account with an identity provider, for example, a user can continue to login to a service provider using existing service provider-specific username and also have benefits if using the identity providers. Further, the identity provider can be federated with other services that provide various applications. As described in detail below, account

federation enables system entities to collaborate to provide user a service or perform a service on behalf of the user”; See also par. [0010]; “Accounts are linked using, for example, dynamically generated, which are shared by service provider and identity provider being linked”; fig. 9; par. [0117]; “Each handle is a dynamically generated, strong random identifier serving as a name for the principal in the namespace between the identity provider and the service provider”].

As per claim 20:

Yared further teaches the method of Claim 9, wherein a user authorizing access to a service by said federation authorizes access to any member of said affiliation [Yared: fig. 9; par. [0047]; par. [0117]].

As per claim 21:

Yared further teaches the method of Claim 9, further comprising the step of:

(a) providing a unique identifier for every affiliation, and responsive to a service provider having a service provider identity requesting an identity of a user through different affiliations, said service provider receiving different, unique identifiers for each affiliation [Yared: figs. 9-10, pars. [0117-0118]].

As per claim 22:

Yared further teaches the method of Claim 9, further comprising the step of:
providing a common identifier to all members of said affiliation when they are acting as a part of

said affiliation [Yared: fig. 9; par. [0117]; *“Identity Provider A 905 is linked with service Provider A 910 and Service provider B 915. User directory 920 for identity provider A 905 illustrates how multiple service provider accounts are linked”; “This configuration allows a user to authentication with multiple service providers 910, 915 using identity provider A 905”*];

As per claim 23:

Yared further teaches the method of Claim 9, further comprising the step of:

providing an affiliation name identifier for allowing sites to handle an automatic federation that take place with all members of said affiliation [Yared: par. [0047]; *“ By federation an account with an identity provider, for example, a user can continue to login to a service provider using existing service provider-specific username and also have benefits if using the identity providers. Further, the identity provider can be federated with other services that provide various applications. As described in detail below, account federation enables system entities to collaborate to provide user a service or perform a service on behalf of the user”; See also par. [0010]; “Accounts are linked using, for example, dynamically generated, which are shared by service provider and identity provider being linked”; fig. 9; par. [0117]; “Each handle is a dynamically generated, strong random identifier serving as a name for the principal in the namespace between the identity provider and the service provider”*].

As per claim 25:

Yared further teaches the method of claim 24, wherein said web services implement a lightweight protocol for exchange of information in a decentralized, distributed environment, and said protocol comprises an envelope that defines a framework for describing what is in a message and how to process it, a set of encoding rules for expressing instances of application-defined data types, and a convention for representing remote procedure calls and responses [Yared : par. [0011]; par. [0064]; “In an embodiment, back channel communications use the Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP). *SOAP* enables a variety of computing devices to interoperate over *HTTP*”; See par. [0153-0161]; Web Services Architecture].

As per claim 26:

This claim has limitations that are similar to those of claim 9, thus it is rejected with the same rationale applied against claim 23 above.

Claims 13-16 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yared et al. (US 2003/0149781 A1) in view of the applicant’s admitted prior art at page 7 line 5 to page 9 line 23 of the specification, fig. 1 and fig. 2 (Prior Art), hereinafter “**AAPA**”.

As per claim 13:

Yared is silent about providing a discovery service for enabling a web service consumer to discover service information regarding a user’s personal web services.

However, AAPA teaches providing a discovery service for enabling a web service consumer to discover service information regarding a user's personal web services [AAPA: fig. 2, pg. 8, line 20 to pg. 9, line 23].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method of Yared by including the teaching of AAPA to provide users with means for obtaining a service descriptor and assertion for service from the discovery service [AAPA: pg. 9, lines 20-23].

As per claim 14:

Yared and AAPA teach the subject matter as described in claim 13.

AAPA further teaches the method of claim 13, further comprising the step of: providing a web service consumer associated with a service provider for requesting a service descriptor and assertion for service from said discovery service and for presenting an assertion from said other service provider with affiliate information [AAPA: fig. 1, pg. 8, lines 14-17].

As per claim 15:

AAPA further teaches the method of claim 14, further comprising the step of: said discovery service checking said other service provider affiliation and generating a service assertion based upon said other service provider affiliation [AAPA: figs. 1-2; pg. 7, line 5 to pg. 9, line 23].

As per claim 16:

AAPA further teaches the method of claim 15, further comprising the step of: said web service consumer invoking a service with said service assertion via a web service provider [AAPA: figs. 1-2; pg. 7, line 5 to pg. 9, line 23].

As per claim 24:

The combination of Yared and AAPA teach the subject matter as described above.

Yared and AAPA further teach the method of claim 9, wherein said network comprises: a web services-based service infrastructure in which users manage sharing of their personal information across identity providers and service providers [Yared: fig. 9, 11; Par. [0153-156]; Web services Architecture; par. [0159]; various identities provider and service provider can extend schemas in many way to store information; par. [0163]; AAPA: figs. 1-2; page 7, line 5 to page 9 line 23].

Conclusion

The examiner requests, in response to this Office action, support be shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line number(s) in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the examiner in prosecuting the application. Failure to show support can result in a non-compliant response.

When responding to this office action, Applicant is advised that if Applicant traverses an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103, a reasoned statement must be included explaining

why the Applicant believes the Office has erred substantively as to the factual findings or the conclusion of obviousness See 37 CFR 1.111(b).

Additionally Applicant is further advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Canh Le whose telephone number is 571-270-1380. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 7:30AM to 5:00PM other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Orgad Edan can be reached on 571-272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Canh Le/

Examiner, Art Unit 2439

June 18, 2009

/Edan Orgad/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2439